

Panaji, 29th July, 1982 (Sravana 7, 1904)

SERIES II No. 18



OFFICIAL GAZETTE

GOVERNMENT OF GOA, DAMAN AND DIU

GOVERNMENT OF GOA, DAMAN AND DIU

Department of Personnel and Administrative Reforms

—
Order

No. 6/3/81-PER

The Services of Shri R. V. Usgaonkar, Grade II officer of Goa, Daman and Diu Civil Service, presently functioning as Additional Director of Municipal Administration are placed at the disposal of the Planning Department, Secretariat, with immediate effect, for appointment by temporary transfer on deputation, as Assistant Project Officer in Rural Development Agency vice Shri B. V. Desai, Grade II officer of Goa, Daman and Diu Civil Service at present on deputation as Assistant Project Officer in Rural Development Agency, thereby curtailing deputation period of Shri B. V. Desai.

2. The appointment of Shri R. V. Usgaonkar as Assistant Project Officer will be governed by the terms and conditions of deputation in Government of India Ministry of Finance (Department of Expenditure) Memo No. F.10(24)-E III/60 dated 4-5-61 as amended from time to time.

3. The Planning Department in the Secretariat will issue orders of deputation of Shri Usgaonkar to Rural Development Agency. Shri Usgaonkar shall be on deputation till October 18, 1982 (Afternoon) on which date the extension of service given to him by the Government expires.

4. Shri B. V. Desai, Grade II Officer of Goa, Daman and Diu Civil Service now on deputation as Assistant Project Officer, Rural Development Agency is transferred and posted as Additional Director of Municipal Administration.

By order and in the name of the Administrator of Goa, Daman and Diu.

G. H. Mascarenhas, Under Secretary (Personnel).

Panaji, 24th July, 1982.

Forest and Agriculture Department

—
Order

No. 1-10-80-FSH

Read:— 1. Govt. order No. 5-20-79/WET dated 27-8-80.
2. Govt. order No. 1-10-80-FSH dated 18-11-81.
3. Letter No. BOD/1.1(a)/82 dated 29-4-82 from the Member Secretary of the Committee.

Government is pleased to extend the time limit for submission of the report of the Committee set up for the establishment of Seaquarium at Dona Paula up to the end of August, 1982.

By order and in the name of the Administrator of Goa, Daman and Diu.

N. P. Gaunekar, Under Secretary to the Govt. of Goa, Daman and Diu.

Panaji, 17th July, 1982.

Notification

No. 1-34-73-FSH-Vol. II (a)

Pursuant to sub-rules (2) and (3) of rule 3, sub-rule (2) of rule 10, sub-rules (5) and (11) of rule 11 of the Goa, Daman and Diu Fisheries Rules, 1981, the Government of Goa, Daman and Diu hereby authorises the Processing Technologist, Fisheries Training Officer and Research Officer in the Directorate of Fisheries, Government of Goa, Daman and Diu, to exercise the powers under the aforesaid provisions of the said Rules.

By order and in the name of the Administrator of Goa, Daman and Diu.

N. P. Gaunekar, Under Secretary to the Govt. of Goa, Daman and Diu.

Panaji, 22nd July, 1982.

Notification

No. 1-34-73-FSH-Vol. II (b)

Pursuant to sub-rules (2) and (3) of rule 3 and sub-rule (11) of rule 11 of the Goa, Daman and Diu Fisheries Rules, 1981, the Government of Goa, Daman and Diu hereby authorises the Deputy Director of Fisheries, Superintendent of Fisheries, Assistant Superintendents of Fisheries and Extension Officers of Fisheries in the Directorate of Fisheries, Government of Goa, Daman and Diu, Panaji, Goa to exercise, within their respective jurisdiction, the powers under the aforesaid provisions of the said Rules.

By order and in the name of the Administrator of Goa, Daman and Diu.

N. P. Gaunekar, Under Secretary to the Govt. of Goa, Daman and Diu.

Panaji, 22nd July, 1982.

Local Administration and Welfare Department

Notification

No. 3-61-81-LAWD

Read: Government Notification No. 3-61-81-LAWD dated 6-11-1981.

Government is pleased to extend the term of the Committee constituted under Notification of even number dated 6-11-1981 for revision of Goa, Daman and Diu Municipalities Act, 1968 upto 6-11-1982.

The Committee should submit the report by the above date.

By order and in the name of the Administrator of Goa, Daman and Diu.

Alexandre Pereira, Under Secretary (Revenue).

Panaji, 20th July, 1982.

Notification

No. 10-18-82-LAWD(COOP)

In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 68 of the Maharashtra Cooperative Societies Act, 1960 (Maharashtra Act 24 of 1961) as in force in the Union Territory of Goa, Daman and Diu, the Administrator of Goa, Daman and Diu hereby notifies the "Goa Pradesh Sahakari Sangh Maryadit, Panaji", as the State Federal Society for the purpose of the aforesaid section until further orders.

2. The said "Goa Pradesh Sahakari Sangh Maryadit, Panaji", shall undertake such educational programmes as may be approved, from time to time, by the Registrar of Cooperative Societies, Panaji.

By order and in the name of the Administrator of Goa, Daman and Diu.

Alexandre Pereira, Under Secretary (Revenue).

Panaji, 17th July, 1982.

Office of the Registrar of Cooperative Societies

Order

No. 15.11.71/ADT

In exercise of the powers vested in me under Section 81(1) of the Maharashtra Co-op. Societies Act, 1960 as applied to the Union Territory of Goa, Daman and Diu, read with Rule 66(1) of the Co-op. Societies Rules, 1962, I, A. Venkataratnam, Registrar of Co-op. Societies, Goa, Daman and Diu, hereby appoint the following Chartered Accountants from the panel of certified auditors notified under Notification No. 15.11.71/ADT dated 5-7-1982 to audit the accounts of the Urban Coop. Banks alongwith the branches for 1981-82 as mentioned against their names on the following terms and conditions:

1. Shri T. S. Mahadevan, The Goa Urban Co-op. Bank A-1, Mayfair Apartments, Ltd., Panaji alongwith its Dr. Dada Vaidya Road, branches. Panaji.
2. Shri S. M. Inchalmath, The Madgaum Urban Co-op. M/s S. M. Inchalmath, E a n k Ltd., Madgaum & Co., Holy Family House, Opp. Cine Lata, alongwith its branches. Margao.
3. Shri S. J. Thaly, M/s S. J. Thaly & Co., Govinda Bldg., Panaji. The Mapusa Urban Co-op. Bank Ltd., Mapusa alongwith its branches.

- i) The above certified auditors will be paid audit fees at the prevailing rates, a copy of which is enclosed.
- ii) All the certified auditors shall release the interim audit reports of the banks allotted to them for the period from 1-7-1981 to 31-12-1981 latest by 31st August, 1982.
- iii) Final audit report of the Bank for 1981-82 covering the period from 1-7-81 to 30-6-1982 should be released latest by 15-12-1982.

- iv) Certified auditors will be permitted to receive their audit fees only after release of the final audit report of the banks allotted to them for audit.

A. Venkataratnam, Registrar of Coop. Societies.

Panaji, 5th July, 1982.

Notification

No. 15.11.71/ADT

In exercise of the powers vested in me under Section 81(1) of the Maharashtra Cooperative Societies Act, 1960 as applied to the Union Territory of Goa, Daman and Diu, read with Rule 66(1) of the Co-operative Societies, 1962, I, A. Venkataratnam, Registrar of Co-operative Societies, Goa, Daman and Diu, hereby constitute the panel of certified auditors for the purpose of audit of the Urban Co-op. Banks for a period of three years from the date of issue of this Notification of the following Chartered Accountants.

1. Shri T. S. Mahadevan, A-1, Mayfair Apartments, Dr. Dada Vaidya Road, Panaji.
2. Shri S. M. Inchalmath, M/s S. M. Inchalmath & Co., Holy Family House, Opp. Cine Lata, Margao.
3. Shri S. J. Thaly, M/s S. J. Thaly & Co., Govinda Bldg., Panaji.
4. Shri C. N. De Sa, M/s C. N. De Sa & Co., 12 Rua de Joao De Castro, Caetano Albuquerque Road, Panaji.
5. Shri U. N. Bene, M/s Naik & Naik, Gadekars Building, Margao.
6. Shri R. K. Verlekar, M/s R. K. Verlekar & Co., Behind Municipality, Margao.
7. Smt. Sheela H. N. Gaunekar, M/s S. N. Borkar & Co., Abade Faria Road, Margao.
8. Shri V. B. Prabhu Verlekar, M/s V. B. Prabhu Verlekar & Co., 102, Govinda Building, Panaji.
9. Shri N. N. Naik Gaunekar, M/s Naik Gaunekar & Co., 1st Floor, Govinda Bldg., Panaji.
10. Shri A. V. Kamat, M/s A. V. Kamat & Co., Vaz Building, 1st Floor, Caetano Albuquerque Road, Panaji.
11. Shri R. V. Virginkar, M/s R. V. Virginkar & Co., Near Kamat Milan Hotel, Station Road, Margao.
12. Shri Ganesh M. Deivajna, M/s Ganesh and Ganesh, Opp. Cine Lata, Margao.
13. Shri S. S. Valanju, Sadashiv Janaki Prasad, Near Mahalaxmi Temple, Panaji.
14. Shri S. S. Dalvi, M/s S. J. Thaly & Co., 1st Floor, Govinda Bldg., Panaji.
15. Shri P. V. Sadekar, M/s Naik & Naik, Govinda Building, Panaji.
16. Shri Prakash P. Pawar, 315, Govinda Bldg., Panaji.

The audit fees payable to the above certified auditors shall be such as may be prescribed by the Registrar of Co-op. Societies from time to time.

A. Venkataratnam, Registrar of Co-operative Societies.

Panaji, 5th July, 1982.

Office of the Asstt. Registrar of Cooperative Societies

No. 1/2/64-SEVA/CANDOLIM/ARNZ/82

Read:—

1. Audit Report of Candolim Agricultural Co-operative Service Society Ltd., for the Coop. Year 1980-81.
2. This office interim order No. 1/2/64-SEVA/CANDOLIM/ARNZ/82 dated 2nd April, 1982 whereunder the society was called upon to submit its explanation, if any, as to why the society should not be wound up.

Order

In virtue of the powers vested in me under section 102(1) of the Maharashtra Cooperative Societies Act, 1960 as applied to the Union Territory of Goa, Daman and Diu, read with Rule 84 of the Cooperative Societies Rules, 1962 the above mentioned society was called upon to submit its explanation as to why the society be not taken into liquidation within one month from the date of issue of interim order mentioned at Sr. No. 2 above. However, no reply has been received from the society and I am satisfied that there is no objection to the society being taken into liquidation. Hence, I, D. V. Sathe, Assistant Registrar of Coop. Societies, North Zone, Mapusa, hereby confirm the aforesaid order in terms of section 102(2) of the aforesaid Act, as applied to the Union Territory of Goa, Daman and Diu.

Further, under section 103(1) of the Maharashtra Cooperative Societies Act, 1960, as applied to the Union Territory of Goa, Daman and Diu read with Rule 86(1) of the Cooperative Societies Rules, 1962, I appoint Shri B. Y. Sawant, Jr. Inspector, Cooperative Societies, North Zone, Mapusa as Liquidator of the Candolim Agricultural Coop. Service Society Ltd., Candolim Goa.

D. V. Sathe, Asstt. Registrar of Coop. Societies, North Zone.

Mapusa, 7th June, 1982.

No. 1/8/69-LQD/Bhagwati-Seva/ARNZ/82

Read: This office order No. ARCS/NZ/RES-(C)-14/Goa/LQD/80 dated 10-4-1981 extending the period of Liquidator of the Bhagwati V.K.S.S. Society Ltd., Parcem-Pernem, up to 12-4-1982.

Order

In virtue of the powers vested in me under section 109(1) of the Maharashtra Cooperative Societies Act, 1960 as applied to the Union Territory of Goa, Daman and Diu, I, D. V. Sathe, Asstt. Registrar of Coop. Societies, North Zone, Mapusa hereby extend the period of the Liquidator of the Bhagwati V.K.S.S. Society Ltd., Parcem-Pernem from 13-4-82 to 12-4-83.

D. V. Sathe, Asstt. Registrar of Coop. Societies, North Zone.

Mapusa, 9th June, 1982.

No. 1/10/68-LQD/Bhagwati-Seva/ARNZ/82

Read: This office order No. 1/10/68-LQD/Bhagwati/Seva ARNZ/82 dated 10th April, 1981 extending the period of the Liquidator of the Bhagwati V.K.S.S. Society Ltd., Pernem up to 12-4-1982.

Order

In virtue of the powers vested in me under section 109(1) of the Maharashtra Cooperative Societies Act, 1960 as applied to the Union Territory of Goa, Daman and Diu, I, D. V. Sathe, Asstt. Registrar of Coop. Societies, North Zone, Mapusa hereby extend the period of the Liquidator of Bhagwati V.K.S.S. Society Ltd., Pernem from 13-4-1982 to 12-4-1983.

D. V. Sathe, Asstt. Registrar of Coop. Societies, North Zone.

Mapusa, 9th June, 1982.

No. 1/13/70-LQD-Bardez-Poultry/ARNZ/82

Read: This office order No. ARCS/NZ/GEN-(C)-7/Goa/LQD/79 dated 31st October, 1979 appointing Shri R. A. Pednekar, Jr. Inspector, Coop. Societies as Liquidator of Bardez Poultry Coop. Society Ltd., in place of Shri I. P. Shetye.

Order

In partial modification of this office order cited above, Shri D. Y. Gawas, Jr. Inspector, Coop. Societies, Mapusa is hereby appointed as Liquidator of Bardez Poultry Coop. Society Ltd., Verem-Bardez in place of Shri R. A. Pednekar with effect from the date of taking over the charge of the society.

D. V. Sathe, Asstt. Registrar of Coop. Societies, North Zone.

Mapusa, 10th June, 1982.

No. 1/6/70-LQD/Shirgal-Aroba/ARNZ

Read: 1. This office order No. ARCS/NZ/RES-(C)-6/Goa/LQD dated 7th July, 1979 appointing Shri R. A. Pednekar, as the Liquidator of the Shirgal Aroba V.K.S.S. Society Ltd., Aroba in place of Shri R. V. Pai Khot.

2. This office order No. 1/6/70-LQD/Shirgal-Aroba/ARNZ/81 dated 18-5-81 extending the period of Liquidator of the Shirgal Aroba V.K.S.S. Society Ltd., Aroba up to 15-5-82.

Order

In virtue of the powers vested in me under section 109(1) of the Maharashtra Cooperative Societies Act, 1960 as applied to the Union Territory of Goa, Daman and Diu, I, D. V. Sathe, Asstt. Registrar of Coop. Societies, North Zone, Mapusa hereby extend the period of liquidator of Shirgal Aroba V.K.S.S. Society Ltd., Aroba from 16-5-82 to 15-5-83.

Further in partial modification of this office order cited above at sr. No. 1 Shri K. B. Desai, Jr. Inspector, Coop. Societies, Mapusa is appointed as the liquidator of the above

society in place of Shri R. A. Pednekar with effect from the date of taking over the charge of the society.

D. V. Sathe, Asstt. Registrar of Coop. Societies, North Zone.

Mapusa, 14th June, 1982.

No. 1/2/65-LQD/Alorna-Ibrampur-Seva/ARNZ

Read: 1. This office order No. ARCS/NZ/RES-(C)-112/Goa/LQD/79 dated 7th July, 1979 appointing Shri R. A. Pednekar, as the Liquidator of Alorna Ibrampur V.K.S.S. Society Ltd., Alorna-Pernem.

2. This office order No. 1/2/65-LQD/Alorna-Ibrampur-Seva/ARNZ/81 dated 10th April, 1981 extending the period of Liquidator of the Alorna Ibrampur V.K.S.S. Society Ltd., Alorna-Pernem up to 12-4-1982.

Order

In virtue of the powers vested in me under section 109(1) of the Maharashtra Cooperative Societies Act, 1960 as applied to the Union Territory of Goa, Daman and Diu, I, D. V. Sathe, Asstt. Registrar of Coop. Societies, North Zone, Mapusa hereby extend the period of Liquidator of Alorna Ibrampur V.K.S.S. Society Ltd., Alorna-Pernem from 13-4-82 to 12-4-83.

Further, in partial modification of this office order cited above Shri K. B. Desai, Jr. Inspector, Coop. Societies, North Zone, Mapusa is hereby appointed as Liquidator of the above society in place of Shri R. A. Pednekar with effect from the date of taking over the charge of the society.

D. V. Sathe, Asstt. Registrar of Coop. Societies, North Zone.

Mapusa, 14th June, 1982.

No. ARCS/NZ/1/5/65-LQD/Mahadeo-Seva/ARNZ

Read: 1. This office order No. ARCS/NZ/RES-(C)-39/Goa/LQD/76 dated 28-5-76 appointing Shri R. A. Pednekar, as the liquidator of Shri Mahadeo V.K.S.S. Society Ltd., Cansarvarnem-Pernem.

2. This office order No. 1/5/65-LQD/Mahadeo-Seva/ARNZ/81 dated 10th April, 1981 extending the period of Liquidator of above society up to 12-4-1982.

Order

In virtue of the powers vested in me under section 109(1) of the Maharashtra Cooperative Societies Act, 1960 as applied to the Union Territory of Goa, Daman and Diu, I, D. V. Sathe, Asstt. Registrar of Coop. Societies, North Zone, Mapusa hereby extend the period of Liquidator of Shri Mahadeo V.K.S.S. Society Ltd., Cansarvarnem, Pernem from 13-4-1982 to 12-4-1983.

Further, in partial modification of this office order cited above, Shri K. B. Desai, Jr. Inspector, Coop. Societies, North Zone, Mapusa is hereby appointed as Liquidator of the above society in place of Shri R. A. Pednekar with effect from the date of taking over the charge of the society.

D. V. Sathe, Asstt. Registrar of Coop. Societies, North Zone.

Mapusa, 14th June, 1982.

No. 1/7/67-LQD/Dhargallim-Seva/ARNZ/82

Read: 1. This office order No. ARCS/NZ/RES-(C)-7/Goa/LQD/79 dated 7-7-79 appointing Shri R. A. Pednekar, as a liquidator of Dhargal V.K.S.S. Society Ltd., Pernem in place of Shri R. V. Pai Khot.

2. This office order No. 1/7/67-LQD/Dhargal ARNZ/81 dated 10th April, 1981 extending the period of Liquidator of Dhargal V.K.S.S. Society Ltd., Pernem up to 12-4-1982.

GOVT. OF GOA, GOVERNMENT OF GOA, ORDER

In virtue of the powers vested in me under section 109(1) of the Maharashtra Cooperative Societies Act, 1960 as applied to the Union Territory of Goa, Daman and Diu, I, D. V. Sathe, Asstt. Registrar of Coop. Societies, North Zone, Mapusa hereby extend the period of the liquidator of Dhangal V.K.S. S. Society Ltd., Pernem from 13-4-1982 to 12-4-1983.

Further, in partial modification of this office order referred to above at sr. No. 1 Shri K. B. Desai, Jr. Inspector Mapusa is hereby appointed as the liquidator of above society in place of Shri R. A. Pednekar from the date of taking over the charge.

D. V. Sathe, Asstt. Registrar of Coop. Societies, North Zone.

Mapusa, 16th June, 1982.

No. 1/35/78-Seva/Narve/ARNZ/82

Read: This office order No. 1/35/78-Seva/Narve/ARNZ/81 dated 21st September, 1981 taking over the Narve V.K.S.S. Society Ltd., Narve into Liquidation and Shri R. A. Pednekar, Jr. Inspector appointed as the Liquidator.

Order

In partial modification of this office order referred to above, Shri B. Y. Sawant, Jr. Inspector, Coop. Societies, Mapusa is hereby appointed as Liquidator of Narve V.K.S.S. Society Ltd., Narve in place of Shri R. A. Pednekar with effect from the date of taking over the charge of the society.

D. V. Sathe, Asstt. Registrar of Coop. Societies, North Zone.

Mapusa, 22nd June, 1982.

No. 1/1/70-LQD/Kamulkar/Cons/ARNZ/82

Read: This office order No. ARCS/NZ/CON-55-Goa/LQD/80 dated 23rd June, 1980 extending the period of liquidator of the Kamulkar High School Students Cons. Coop. Society Ltd., Corgao-Pernem up to 6-6-1981.

Order

In virtue of the powers vested in me under section 109(1) of the Maharashtra Cooperative Societies Act, 1960 as applied to the Union Territory of Goa, Daman and Diu, I, D. V. Sathe, Asstt. Registrar of Coop. Societies, North Zone, Mapusa hereby extend the period of the Liquidator of the Kamulkar High School Consumer Cooperative Society Ltd., Corgao-Pernem from 7-6-1981 to 6-6-83.

D. V. Sathe, Asstt. Registrar of Coop. Societies, North Zone.

Mapusa, 23rd June, 1982.

No. 1/20/64-LQD/Bardez-Fish/ARNZ

Read: This office order No. 1/66/LQD/Bardez/FSH/ARNZ dated 8th January, 1981 extending the period of the liquidator of the Bardez Fisheries Cooperative Society Ltd., Verem-Bardez up to 7-1-1982.

Order

In virtue of the powers vested in me under section 109 (1) of the Maharashtra Cooperative Societies Act, 1960 as applied to the Union Territory of Goa, Daman and Diu, I, D. V. Sathe, Asstt. Registrar of Coop. Societies, North Zone, Mapusa hereby extend the period of the Liquidator of the Bardez Fisheries Cooperative Society Ltd., Verem-Bardez up to 7-1-1983.

D. V. Sathe, Asstt. Registrar of Coop. Societies, North Zone.

Mapusa, 23rd June, 1982.

No. 1/12/75-LQD/Korgao-Seva/ARNZ/82

Read: This office order No. 1/12/75-LQD/KORGAO/ARNZ/81 dated 10-4-1981 extending the period of the Liquidator of Corgao V.K.S.S. Society Ltd., Corgao-Pernem up to 12-4-1982.

Order

In virtue of the powers vested in me under section 109 (1) of the Maharashtra Cooperative Societies Act, 1960 as applied to the Union Territory of Goa, Daman and Diu, I, D. V. Sathe, Asstt. Registrar of Coop. Societies, North Zone, Mapusa hereby extend the period of the Liquidator of Corgao V.K.S.S. Society Ltd., Corgao-Pernem, from 13-4-82 to 12-4-83.

D. V. Sathe, Asstt. Registrar of Coop. Societies, North Zone.

Mapusa, 23rd June, 1982.

No. 7-21-78/ARSZ-LQD/2822

Read:— 1. This Office Order No. RES-(c)-13/Goa/LQD/Notice/72 dated 21-8-1972 from the office of the Registrar of Coop. Societies, Goa, Daman and Diu, Panaji, placing the San Jose de Areal Service Coop. Society Ltd., Salcete under liquidation and appointing liquidator in terms of Section 103(1) of the Maharashtra Coop. Societies Act, 1960 as applied to the Union Territory of Goa, Daman and Diu.
2. Letter No. nil dated 25-4-1980 from the liquidator of the society sending the final report in terms of Section 109(2) of the Maharashtra Coop. Societies Act, 1960 as applied to the Union Territory of Goa, Daman and Diu.

Order

In virtue of the powers vested in me under provisions of Section 109(2) and 21 of the Maharashtra Coop. Societies Act, 1960 as applied to the Union Territory of Goa, Daman and Diu, I, Y. S. Manerikar, Asstt. Registrar of Coop. Societies, South Zone, Margao hereby terminate the liquidation proceedings and cancel the registration bearing No. RES-(c)-13/Goa dated 13-12-1963 of San Jose de Areal Service Coop. Society Ltd., Salcete with effect from the date of issue of this order.

Y. S. Manerikar, Asstt. Registrar of Coop. Societies, South Zone.

Margao, 7th July, 1982.

No. 10-4-81/ARCS/CZ

Read:— Interim order No. 10-4-81/ARSZ dated 12th March 1982 from the Asstt. Registrar of Coop. Societies, South Zone, Margao appointing Shri U. P. Talaulicar, Sr. Inspector Coop. Societies, South Zone, Margao as Liquidator of Borim V. K. S. S. Society Ltd., Borim, Ponda.

Order

In partial modification of order referred to above Shri A. K. Marathe, Jr. Inspector of Coop. Societies, Central Zone, Panaji is hereby appointed as liquidator of Borim V. K. S. S. Society Ltd., Borim Ponda vice Shri U. P. Talaulicar, Sr. Inspector Coop. Societies, South Zone, Margao from the date of his taking over the charge.

V. G. Patil, Asstt. Registrar of Coop. Societies, Central Zone.
Panaji, 22nd June, 1982.

No. 7-50-78/ARCS/CZ

Read:— Interim order No. 7-50-78/ARSZ-LQD dated 15th February 1982 from the Asstt. Registrar of Coop. Societies, South Zone, Margao appointing Shri N. S. Naik, Jr. Inspector Coop. Societies South Zone, Margao.

as Liquidator of Government High School Khandola School Complex Staff and Students Cons. Coop. Society Ltd., Khandola-Marcel-Goa.

Order

In partial modification of order referred to above Shri R. A. Phadte, Sr. Inspector Coop. Societies, Central Zone Panaji is hereby appointed as liquidator of Government High School Khandola School Complex Staff and Students Cons. Coop. Society Ltd., Khandola vice Shri N. S. Naik, Jr. Inspector Coop. Societies South Zone, Margao from the date of his taking over the charge.

V. G. Patil, Asstt. Registrar of Coop. Societies, Central Zone.
Panaji, 22nd June, 1982.

No. 18-9-80/ARSZ/CONS/2389/82

Read: (1) Audit Report of Murgao Citizen Consumers Coop. Society Ltd., Vasco for the Coop. Year 1978-79 and 1979-80.
(2) Letter dated 21-1-1982 from Chairman of Murgao Citizen Consumers Coop. Society Ltd., Vasco.
(3) This Office interim Order No. 18-9-80/ARSZ/CONS/3634/82 dated 19-4-1982.

Order

In virtue of the powers vested in me under Section 102(1) of the Maharashtra Coop. Societies Act, 1960 as applied to the Union Territory of Goa, Daman and Diu the Murgao Citizen Cons. Coop. Society Ltd., Vasco was called upon to submit its explanation if any, within one month from the date of issue of interim Order cited above. Since no reply has been received so far from the Society, I am satisfied that there is no objection in regard to the society being taken into Liquidation. Hence I, Y. S. Manerikar, Asstt. Registrar of Coop. Societies, South Zone, Margao-Goa hereby confirm the aforesaid Order in terms of Section 102(2) of the aforesaid Act, as applied to the Union Territory of Goa, Daman and Diu.

Further under Section 103(1) of the Maharashtra Cooperative Societies Act, 1960 as applied to the Union Territory of Goa, Daman and Diu read with Rule 86 (1) of the Coop. Societies Rules, 1962. I further appoint Shri Anil K. Naik Dessai, Jr. Inspector, Coop. Societies, South Zone, Margao-Goa as a Liquidator of Murgao Citizen Consumers Coop. Society Ltd., Vasco.

Y. S. Manerikar, Asstt. Registrar of Coop. Societies, South Zone.

Margao, 16th June, 1982.

No. 7-31-79/ARCZ/LQN/82

Read:— 1) Office order No. ARCS/SZ/MMMCS/7804/81 dated 22-6-81 from the Asstt. Registrar of Coop. Societies South Zone, Margao appointing Shri P. G. Naik, Jr. Inspector Coop. Societies, South Zone, Margao as Liquidator of Shri Manguesh Mahalsa Mahila Sahakari Grahak Bhandar Ltd., Mardol-Ponda.
2) Office order No. ARCS/SZ/MMMCS/20/81 dated 13-10-1981 from the Asstt. Registrar Coop. Societies South Zone, Margao confirming the above order at S. No. 1.

Order

In partial modification of orders referred to above Shri R. A. Phadte, Sr. Inspector of Coop. Societies, Central Zone, Panaji is hereby appointed as liquidator of Shri Manguesh Mahalsa Mahila Sahakari Grahak Bhandar Ltd., Mardol-Ponda vice Shri P. G. Naik, Jr. Inspector, Coop. Societies South Zone, Margao from the date of his taking over the charge.

V. G. Patil, Asstt. Registrar of Coop. Societies, Central Zone.

Panaji, 3rd June, 1982.

No. 1/3/67-LQD/Lokmanya-Seva/ARNZ

Read: This office order No. ARCS/NZ/13/Goa/LQN/79 dated 31st October, 1979 appointing Shri Prakash Gawas, Bank Inspector, Goa State Coop. Bank Ltd., Pernem Branch as Liquidator of the Lokmanya V. K. S. S. Society Ltd., Morjim Pernem in place of Shri Sambhaji Patil.

Order

In partial modification of this office order cited above, Shri R. J. Parab, Bank Inspector, Goa State Coop. Bank Ltd., Pernem-Branch is hereby appointed as Liquidator of the Lokmanya V.K.S.S. Society Ltd., Morjim, Pernem vice Shri P. H. Gawas, with effect from the date of taking over the charge of the society.

D. V. Sathe, Asstt. Registrar of Coop. Societies, North Zone.

Mapusa, 7th June, 1982.

No. 1/12/75-LQD/Korgao-Seva/ARNZ

Read: 1— This office order No. RES-(c)-8/Goa/LQD/79 dated 9-7-1979 appointing Shri P. H. Gawas, Bank Inspector, Goa State Coop. Bank Ltd., Pernem Branch as Liquidator of the Corgao V.K.S.S. Society Ltd., Corgao-Pernem.
2— This office order No. ARCS/NZ/RES-(C)-8/Goa/LQD/80 dated 11-4-80 extending the period of the liquidator of the Corgao V. K. S. S. Society Ltd., Corgao-Pernem up to 12-4-1981.
3— This office order No. 1/12/75-LQD/Korgao/ARNZ/81 dated 10th April, 1981 extending the period of the liquidator of Corgao V. K. S. S. Society Ltd., Corgao-Pernem up to 12-4-1982.

Order

In partial modification of this office order cited above at sr. No. 1 Shri R. J. Parab, Bank Inspector, Goa State Coop. Bank Ltd., Pernem-Branch is hereby appointed as Liquidator of Corgao V. K. S. S. Society Ltd., Corgao-Pernem in place of Shri P. H. Gawas with effect from the date of taking over the charge.

D. V. Sathe, Asstt. Registrar of Coop. Societies, North Zone.

Mapusa, 5th June, 1982.

No. 1/1/70-LQD-Kamulkar-Cons/ARNZ

Read: 1. This office order No. ARCS/NZ/CON-55-Goa/LQD/79 dated 9th July, 1979 appointing Shri Prakash Gawas, Bank Inspector of Goa State Coop. Bank Ltd., Pernem-Branch as the Liquidator of Kamulkar High School Students Cons. Coop. Society Ltd., Corgao-Pernem.
2. This office order No. ARCS/NZ/CON-55-Goa/LQD/80 dated 23rd June, 1980 extending the period of liquidator of Kamulkar High School Students Cons. Coop. Society Ltd., Corgao up to 6-6-1981.

Order

In partial modification of this office order cited above at Sr. No. 1 Shri R. J. Parab, Bank Inspector of Goa State Coop. Bank Ltd., Pernem-Branch is hereby appointed as the Liquidator of the Kamulkar High School Students Cons. Coop. Society Ltd., Corgao-Pernem in place of Shri P. H. Gawas with effect from the date of taking over the charge.

D. V. Sathe, Asstt. Registrar of Coop. Societies, North Zone.

Mapusa, 5th June, 1982.

No. 1/37/78-Seva/Honda/ARNZ/82

Read: This office order No. 1/37/78-Seva/Honda/ARNZ/81 dated 21st November, 1981 taking the Honda Group V. K. S. S. Society into liquidation and appointing to Shri R. J. Parab, Bank Inspector, Goa State Coop. Bank Ltd., Sankhali-Branch as the liquidator.

Order

In partial modification of this office order referred to above, Shri P. H. Gawas, Bank Inspector, Goa State Coop. Bank Ltd., Sanquelim Branch is hereby appointed as liquidator of Honda Group V. K. S. S. Society Ltd., Honda-Satari in place of Shri R. J. Parab with effect from taking over the charge.

D. V. Sathe, Asstt. Registrar of Coop. Societies, North Zone.

Mapusa, 2nd June, 1982.

No. 2/4/71-ADM/Parye-Seva/ARNZ/82

Read: This office order No. 2/4/71-Seva/Parye/ARNZ/81 dated 25th July, 1981 taking Paryem Group V. K. S. S. Society into liquidation and appointing to Shri R. J. Parab as Liquidator.

Order

In partial modification of this office order referred to above, Shri P. H. Gawas, Bank Inspector, Goa State Coop. Bank Ltd., Sanquelim Branch is hereby appointed as liquidator of Paryem Group V. K. S. S. Society Ltd., Paryem-Satari in place of Shri R. J. Parab, with effect from the date of taking over the charge.

D. V. Sathe, Asstt. Registrar of Coop. Societies, North Zone.

Mapusa, 2nd June, 1982.

No. 1/25/70/Seva/Vaghure/ARNZ/32

Read: This office order No. 1/25/70-SEVA/VAGHURE/ARNZ/81 dated 21st July, 1981 taking Shri Shantadurga V. K. S. S. Society Ltd., Vaghure-Satari into liquidation and appointing Shri R. J. Parab, Bank Inspector of Goa State Coop. Bank Ltd., Sankhali-Branch as the Liquidator.

Order

In partial modification of this office order referred to above, Shri P. H. Gawas, Bank Inspector, Goa State Coop. Bank

Revenue Department

Notification

No. 22/64/82-RD

Whereas it appears to the Appropriate Government (hereinafter referred to as "the Government") that the land specified in the schedule hereto (hereinafter referred to as the "said land") is likely to be needed for public purpose viz. For construction of Post Office Building and Staff Quarters at Chaudi, Canacona.

Therefore the Government is pleased to notify under sub-section (1) of Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (hereinafter referred to as the "said Act") that the said land is likely to be needed for the purpose specified above.

2. All persons interested in the said land are hereby warned not to obstruct or interfere with any surveyor or other persons employed upon the said land for the purpose of the said acquisition. Any contracts for the disposal of the said land by sale, mortgage, assignment, exchange or otherwise, or any outlay commenced or improvements made thereon without the sanction of the Collector appointed in paragraph 4 below, after the date of the publication of this Notification, will under clause (seventh) of Section 24 of the said Act, be disregarded by him while assessing com-

Ltd., Sanquelim Branch is hereby appointed as liquidator of Shri Shantadurga V. K. S. S. Society Ltd., Vaghure-Satari in place of Shri R. J. Parab with effect from the date of taking over the charge.

D. V. Sathe, Asstt. Registrar of Coop. Societies, North Zone.

Mapusa, 2nd June, 1982.

No. 1/20/69-Seva/KERI/ARNZ/82

Read: This office order No. 1/20/69-SEVA/KERI/ARNZ/82 dated 9th February, 1982 taking Keri Group V. K. S. S. Society Ltd., Kerim-Satari into liquidation and appointing Shri R. J. Parab, Bank Inspector, Goa State Coop. Bank Ltd., Sankhali-Branch as the Liquidator.

Order

In partial modification of this office order referred to above, Shri P. H. Gawas, Bank Inspector, Goa State Coop. Bank Ltd., Sankhali Branch is hereby appointed as liquidator of Keri Group V. K. S. S. Society Ltd., Keri-Satari in place of Shri R. J. Parab with effect from the date of taking over the charge.

D. V. Sathe, Asstt. Registrar of Coop. Societies, North Zone.

Mapusa, 2nd June, 1982.

No. 1/23/79-LDQ/AMONA-Seva/ARNZ

Read: This office order No. ARCS/NZ/RES-(c)-47//Goa/LQD/79 dated 28th July, 1979 appointing Shri R. J. Parab, Bank Inspector, Goa State Coop. Bank Ltd., as the Liquidator of the aforesaid society.

Order

In partial modification of this office order cited above, Shri P. H. Gawas, Bank Inspector, the Goa State Coop. Bank Ltd., Sanquelim Branch is hereby appointed as the liquidator of Amone V. K. S. S. Society Ltd., Amone-Bicholim in place of Shri R. J. Parab with effect from the date of taking over the charge of the society.

D. V. Sathe, Asstt. Registrar of Coop. Societies, North Zone.

Mapusa, 2nd June, 1982.

penalty for such parts of the said land as may be finally acquired.

3. If the Government is satisfied that the said land is needed for the aforesaid purpose, a declaration to that effect under Section 6 of the said Act will be published in the Official Gazette, in due course. If the acquisition is abandoned wholly or in part, the fact will be notified.

4. The Government is further pleased to appoint under clause (c) of Section 3 of the said Act the Deputy Collector (Land Acquisition Officer), Panaji to perform the functions of a Collector under the said Act in respect of the said land.

5. The Government is also pleased to authorise under sub-section (2) of Section 4 of the said Act, the following officers to do the acts, specified therein in respect of the said land.

1. The Collector of Goa, Panaji.
2. The Deputy Collector (Land Acquisition Officer), Panaji.
3. The Sr. Superintendent of Post offices, Goa Division, Panaji.
4. The Director of Land Survey, Panaji.

6. A rough plan of the said land is available for inspection in the office of the Dy. Collector (Land Acquisition Officer), Panaji, for a period of 30 days from the date of publication of this Notification in the Official Gazette.

SCHEDULE

(Description of the said land)

Sr. No.	Taluka	Village/Ward	Plot No.	Survey No.	Names of the persons believed to be interested	Approximate area in sq. mts.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	Canacona	Chaudi	—	48/2	Mr. R. V. Rajadhanya.	1125.00
				48/4	Mr. Suresh Nagarsekar. Mr. Pandari Talwadkar. Mr. Vithal Rajadhakshya. Mr. Abhay Narayan Desai. T: Mukund Bhiku Raikar.	325.00
				48/5	Mr. Salvador Fernandes.	300.00
					<i>Boundaries:</i> North: Road. South: Survey No. 48/4, 5. East: Survey No. 47/1. West: Survey No. 48/2, 3.	
					Total	1750.00

By order and in the name of the Lt. Governor of Goa, Daman and Diu.

S. Regunathan, Secretary (Revenue).

Panaji, 13th July, 1982.

Notification

No. 22/44/82-RD

Whereas it appears to the Appropriate Government (hereinafter referred to as "the Government") that the land specified in the schedule hereto (hereinafter referred to as the "said land") is likely to be needed for public purpose viz. For Link Road at Dabolim.

Therefore the Government is pleased to notify under sub-section (1) of Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (hereinafter referred to as the "said Act") that the said land is likely to be needed for the purpose specified above.

2. All persons interested in the said land are hereby warned not to obstruct or interfere with any surveyor or other persons employed upon the said land for the purpose of the said acquisition. Any contracts for the disposal of the said land by sale, mortgage, assignment, exchange or otherwise, or any outlay commenced or improvements made thereon without the sanction of the Collector appointed in paragraph 4 below, after the date of the publication of this Notification, will under clause (seventh) of Section 24 of the said Act, be disregarded by him while assessing compensation for such parts of the said land as may be finally acquired.

3. If the Government is satisfied that the said land is needed for the aforesaid purpose, a declaration to that effect under Section 6 of the said Act will be published in the Official Gazette, in due course. If the acquisition is abandoned wholly or in part, the fact will be notified.

4. The Government is further pleased to appoint under clause (c) of Section 3 of the said Act the Deputy Collector, South Sub-Division, Margao, to perform the functions of a Collector under the said Act in respect of the said land.

5. The Government is also pleased to authorise under sub-section (2) of Section (4) of the said Act, the following officers to do the acts, specified therein in respect of the said land.

1. The Collector of Goa, Panaji.
2. The Deputy Collector, South Sub-Division, Margao.
3. The Block Development Officer, Salcete-Mormugao, Margao, Goa.
4. The Director of Land Survey, Panaji.

6. A rough plan of the said land is available for inspection in the office of the Deputy Collector, South Sub-Division, Margao for a period of 30 days from the date of publication of this Notification in the Official Gazette.

SCHEDULE

(Description of the said land)

Sr. No.	Taluka	Village/Ward	Plot No.	Survey No.	Names of the persons believed to be interested	Approximate area in sq. mts.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	Mormugao	Dabolim	21/1 (Part)		1. Smt. Laximibai Jaganath Naik. 2. Shri Vithal Jaganath Naik.	225.00
					<i>Boundaries:</i> North: Road. South: Existing road and survey No. 21/1. East: Survey No. 21/1. West: Survey No. 21/1.	
					Total	225.00

By order and in the name of the Lt. Governor of Goa, Daman and Diu.

S. Regunathan, Secretary (Revenue).

Panaji, 16th July, 1982.

Notification

No. 22/66/82-RD

Whereas it appears to the Appropriate Government (hereinafter referred to as "the Government") that the land specified in the schedule hereto (hereinafter referred to as the "said land") is likely to be needed for public purpose viz. For construction of road leading to St. Pius X High School at Orlim, Salcete.

Therefore the Government is pleased to notify under sub-section (1) of Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (hereinafter referred to as the "said Act") that the said land is likely to be needed for the purpose specified above.

2. All persons interested in the said land are hereby warned not to obstruct or interfere with any surveyor or other persons employed upon the said land for the purpose of the said acquisition. Any contracts for the disposal of the said land by sale, mortgage, assignment, exchange or otherwise, or any outlay commenced or improvements made thereon without the sanction of the Collector appointed in paragraph 4 below, after the date of the publication of this Notification, will under clause (seventh) of Section 24 of the said Act, be disregarded by him while assessing compensation for such parts of the said land as may be finally acquired.

3. If the Government is satisfied that the said land is needed for the aforesaid purpose, a declaration to that effect under Section 6 of the said Act will be published in the Official Gazette, in due course. If the acquisition is abandoned wholly or in part, the fact will be notified.

4. The Government is further pleased to appoint under clause (c) of Section 3 of the said Act the Deputy Collector, South Sub-Division, Margao, to perform the functions of a Collector under the said Act in respect of the said land.

5. The Government is also pleased to authorise under sub-section (2) of Section (4) of the said Act, the following officers to do the acts, specified therein in respect of the said land.

1. The Collector of Goa, Panaji.

2. The Deputy Collector, South Sub-Division, Margao.

3. The Block Development Officer, Salcete-Mormugao, Margao-Goa.

4. The Director of Land Survey, Panaji.

6. A rough plan of the said land is available for inspection in the office of the Dy. Collector, South Sub-Division, Margao, for a period of 30 days from the date of publication of this Notification in the Official Gazette.

SCHEDULE

(Description of the said land)

Sr. No.	Taluka	Village/Ward	Plot No.	Survey No.	Names of the persons believed to be interested	Approximate area in sq. mts.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	Salcete	Orlim	—	53/5	1. Luzy da Silva alias Luzia da Silva. 2. Ladavica Dias Pereira. 3. Senhorinha Almeida.	300.00
					<i>Boundaries:</i> North: Survey No. 53, Sub-Division No. 3 & 4. South: Survey No. 53 Sub-Division No. 6. East: Road. West: Survey No. 53, Sub-Division No. 1.	
					Total	300.00

By order and in the name of the Lt. Governor of Goa, Daman and Diu.

S. Regunathan, Secretary (Revenue).

Panaji, 13th July, 1982.

Notification

No. 22/70/82-RD

Whereas it appears to the Appropriate Government (hereinafter referred to as "the Government") that the land specified in the schedule hereto (hereinafter referred to as the "said land") is likely to be needed for public purpose viz. For widening and black topping of Konde-Quepem road at Quepem.

Therefore the Government is pleased to notify under sub-section (1) of Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (hereinafter referred to as the "said Act") that the said land is likely to be needed for the purpose specified above.

2. All persons interested in the said land are hereby warned not to obstruct or interfere with any surveyor or other persons employed upon the said land for the purpose of the said acquisition. Any contracts for the disposal of the said land by sale, mortgage, assignment, exchange or otherwise, or any outlay commenced or improvements made thereon without the sanction of the Collector appointed in paragraph 4 below, after the date of the publication of this Notification, will under clause (seventh) of Section 24 of the said Act, be disregarded by him while assessing compensation for such parts of the said land as may be finally acquired.

3. If the Government is satisfied that the said land is needed for the aforesaid purpose, a declaration to that effect under Section 6 of the said Act will be published in the Official Gazette, in due course. If the acquisition is abandoned wholly or in part, the fact will be notified.

4. The Government is further pleased to appoint under clause (c) of Section 3 of the said Act the Land Acquisition Officer, P.W.D. (Cell), Altinho, Panaji, to perform the functions of a Collector under the said Act in respect of the said land.

5. The Government is also pleased to authorise under sub-section (2) of Section (4) of the said Act, the following officers to do the acts, specified therein in respect of the said land.

1. The Collector of Goa, Panaji.

2. The Land Acquisition Officer, P.W.D. (Cell), Altinho, Panaji.

3. The Executive Engineer, Works Division VI, P.W.D., Fatorda, Margao.

4. The Director of Land Survey, Panaji.

6. A rough plan of the said land is available for inspection in the office of the Land Acquisition Officer, P.W.D. (Cell), Altinho, Panaji, for a period of 30 days from the date of publication of this Notification in the Official Gazette.

SCHEDULE
(Description of the said land)

Sr. No.	Taluka	Village/Ward	Plot No.	Survey No.	Names of the persons believed to be interested	Approximate area in sq. mts.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	Quepem	Quepem	—	119/3 (Part)	Gopal Govind Poi Raiturcar.	180.00
				120/4 (Part)	Aleluia Dias.	90.00
				120/5	Mudesham Temple.	450.00
				132/1 (Part)	Gopal Govind Poi Raiturcar.	250.00
				121 (Part)	Gopal Govind Poi Raiturcar.	1050.00
					<i>Boundaries:</i>	
					North: Survey No. 120/9, 120/4, 119/3 and road.	
					South: Survey No. 132/1, 120/5, 120/0 and road.	
					East: Survey No. 132/1, 120/5, 120/4 and road.	
					West: Road, Survey No. 121/0.	
					Total	2020.00

By order and in the name of the Lt. Governor of Goa, Daman and Diu,

S. Regunathan, Secretary (Revenue).

Panaji, 20th July, 1982.

Notification

No. 22/69/82-RD

Whereas it appears to the Appropriate Government (hereinafter referred to as "the Government") that the land specified in the schedule hereto (hereinafter referred to as the "said land") is likely to be needed for public purpose viz. For construction of road from Taripanto to Muguli at Sanguem.

Therefore the Government is pleased to notify under sub-section (1) of Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (hereinafter referred to as the "said Act") that the said land is likely to be needed for the purpose specified above.

2. All persons interested in the said land are hereby warned not to obstruct or interfere with any surveyor or other persons employed upon the said land for the purpose of the said acquisition. Any contracts for the disposal of the said land by sale, mortgage, assignment, exchange or otherwise, or any outlay commenced or improvements made thereon without the sanction of the Collector appointed in paragraph 4 below, after the date of the publication of this Notification, will under clause (seventh) of Section 24 of the said Act, be disregarded by him while assessing compensation for such parts of the said land as may be finally acquired.

3. If the Government is satisfied that the said land is needed for the aforesaid purpose, a declaration to that effect

under Section 6 of the said Act will be published in the Official Gazette, in due course. If the acquisition is abandoned wholly or in part, the fact will be notified.

4. The Government is further pleased to appoint under clause (c) of Section 3 of the said Act the Land Acquisition Officer, P.W.D. (CELL), Altinho, Panaji, to perform the functions of a Collector under the said Act in respect of the said land.

5. The Government is also pleased to authorise under sub-section (2) of Section 4 of the said Act, the following officers to do the acts, specified therein in respect of the said land.

1. The Collector of Goa, Panaji.
2. The Land Acquisition Officer, P.W.D. (CELL), Altinho, Panaji.
3. The Executive Engineer, Works Division VI, P.W.D., Fatorda, Margao.
4. The Director of Land Survey, Panaji.

6. A rough plan of the said land is available for inspection in the office of the Land Acquisition Officer, P.W.D. (CELL), Altinho, Panaji, for a period of 30 days from the date of publication of this Notification in the Official Gazette.

SCHEDULE
(Description of the said land)

Sr. No.	Taluka	Village/Ward	Plot No.	Survey No.	Names of the persons believed to be interested	Approximate area in sq. mts.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	Sanguem	Sanguem Town		60 (Part)	Silva de Miranda.	1950.00
				59 (Part)	Mahadev R. Kudchodkar.	2300.00
				57 (Part)	Shivaji Kakodkar.	250.00
				56 (Part)	Laxman Pandu Salgaonkar.	1000.00

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Sanguem	Sanguem Town		55(Part)	Dharmu Ghanu Salgaonkar.		1200.00
<i>Boundaries:</i>						
				North: Village boundary of Muguli, Survey No. 59 & Survey No. 60.		
				South: Survey No. 60 and Survey No. 59.		
				East: Survey No. 55 Survey No. 56 Survey No. 57 Survey No. 59 & road.		
				West: Survey No. 55, Survey No. 56, Survey No. 57, Survey No. 59 and Survey No. 60.		
Sanguem	Muguli	—	70(Part)	Maria Jose D'Costa Miranda.		4250.00
			5/Part	Vithal Anant Kamant Haldankar.		1750.00
			7/3(Part)	Sham Sanvordenkar.		2500.00
			7/2(Part)	Sodiya Baba.		600.00
			7/1(Part)	Manguesh Vithoba Sinai Dhume.		1400.00
			10(Part)	Piedade Fernandes.		4650.00
			12(Part)	1. Babu Jiva Desai. 2. Fondu Jiva Desai. 3. Raghunath Babai Desai. 4. Narba Ram Desai. 5. Poko Baban Desai. 6. Kushali K. Desai. 7. Nuno Sanvio Desai. 8. Kashi Shanu Desai. 9. Ganesh Narba Desai. 10. Apa Baban Desai. 11. Toyo Mono Desai. 12. Ganba Kust Desai. 13. Laxmi Janu Desai. 14. Bhikaro Barkelo Desai. 15. Pandari Barkelo Desai.		1000.00
<i>Boundaries:</i>						
				North: Survey No. 12, Survey No. 7/2, Survey No. 3, Survey No. 5 & land already acquired by P.W.D.		
				South: Village boundary of Sanguem Town, Survey No. 6 and Survey No. 7/2.		
				East: Survey No. 12, Survey No. 10, Survey No. 7 & Survey No. 70.		
				West: Survey No. 12, Survey No. 10, Survey No. 7 & Survey No. 70.		
				Total		22,850.00

By order and in the name of the Lt. Governor of Goa, Daman and Diu.

S. Regunathan, Secretary (Revenue).

Panaji, 20th July, 1982.

Notification

No. 22/67/82-RD

Whereas it appears to the Appropriate Government (hereinafter referred to as "the Government") that the land specified in the schedule hereto (hereinafter referred to as the "said land") is likely to be needed for public purpose viz. for construction of drinking water well at Gaonkarwado, Veluem, Satari.

Therefore the Government is pleased to notify under sub-section (1) of Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (hereinafter referred to as the "said Act") that the said land is likely to be needed for the purpose specified above.

2. All persons interested in the said land are hereby warned not to obstruct or interfere with any surveyor or other persons employed upon the said land for the purpose of the said acquisition. Any contracts for the disposal of the said land by sale, mortgage, assignment, exchange or otherwise, or any outlay commenced or improvements made thereon without the sanction of the Collector appointed in paragraph 4 below, after the date of the publication of this Notification, will under clause (seventh) of Section 24 of the said Act, be disregarded by him while assessing compensation for such parts of the said land as may be finally acquired.

3. If the Government is satisfied that the said land is needed for the aforesaid purpose, a declaration to that effect under Section 6 of the said Act will be published in the Official Gazette, in due course. If the acquisition is abandoned wholly or in part, the fact will be notified.

4. The Government is further pleased to appoint under clause (c) of Section 3 of the said Act the Land Acquisition Officer, P.W.D. (CELL), Altinho, Panaji, to perform the functions of a Collector under the said Act in respect of the said land.

5. The Government is also pleased to authorise under sub-section (2) of Section (4) of the said Act, the following officers to do the acts, specified therein in respect of the said land.

1. The Collector of Goa, Panaji.
2. The Land Acquisition Officer, P.W.D. (CELL), Altinho, Panaji.
3. The Executive Engineer, Works Division XVII (RWS), F. W. D., Panaji.
4. The Director of Land Survey, Panaji.

6. A rough plan of the said land is available for inspection in the office of the Land Acquisition Officer, P.W.D. (CELL), Altinho, Panaji, for a period of 30 days from the date of publication of this Notification in the Official Gazette.

SCHEDULE
(Description of the said land)

Sr. No.	Taluka	Village/Ward	Plot No.	Survey No.	Names of the persons believed to be interested	Approximate area in sq. mts.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Satari	Velguem	—	5/4 (Part)	5/4 (Part)	Soma Rama Gaonkar. Pundalik Chandre Gaonkar. Rama Sharbo Gaonkar. Govind Ladu Gaonkar. Vishnu Chepo Usapkar.	400.00
					Govind Ladu Gaonkar. Demgo Laxman Gaonkar. Shaba Mahadev Gaonkar. Pundalik Chandru Gaonkar. Keshav Apa Gaonkar.	400.00
			5/5 (Part)	5/5 (Part)	Boundaries:	
					North: Survey No. 5/4 & 5/5. South: Survey No. 5/6 & 5/5. East: Survey No. 5/5. West: Survey No. 5/4.	
Total						800.00

By order and in the name of the Lt. Governor of Goa, Daman and Diu.

S. Regunathan, Secretary (Revenue).

Panaji, 13th July, 1982.

Corrigendum

No. 22/90/81-RD

Read: Government Notification No. 22/90/81-RD dated 8-8-1981 published on pages 199 & 200 of Series II, No. 21 of the Official Gazette dt. 20-8-1981.

In the above Government Notification, the Survey number of plot in column 5 of Schedule should be read as 140/4 instead of 140/3 and the area in Column No. 7 against this plot should be read as 1,014.00 sq. mts. instead of 952.00 sq. mts.

Addendum also is hereby issued to the above Government Notification which may be read in the Schedule as under:

Sr. No.	Taluka	Village/Ward	Plot No.	Survey No.	Name of the person believed to be interested	Approximate area in sq. mts.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	Tiswadi	Mercurim	—	88/2(Part)	Vithalrao Sinai Dempo.	62.00

By order and in the name of the Lt. Governor of Goa, Daman and Diu.

S. Regunathan, Secretary (Revenue).

Panaji, 21st July, 1982.

Notification

No. RD/TNC/BND/280/67-III

In pursuance of the proviso to sub-section (3) of Section 26 of the Goa, Daman and Diu Agricultural Tenancy Act, 1964, the Government hereby specify the following bund/s prescribed in the schedule appended hereto as protective bund/s for the purpose of the said proviso:—

SCHEDULE

Sr. No.	Name of the bund	Village	Taluka	Approximate area protected (in Hectares)	Description of the bund
1	2	3	4	5	6
1.	"Kharo Bundh"	Pernem	Pernem	50 Ha.	The bund starts with the paddy field "Kharo Bundh" situated at Pernem and ends with the same paddy field and is situated marginal to river Tiracol.
2.	"Canturli"	Corjuem Aldona	Bardez	14 Ha.	The bund starts with the paddy field "Canturli" belonging to Shri Rangel of Bastora and ends with the same paddy field. It is situated at Corjuem, Bardez Taluka and runs marginal to the creek of Mapusa river.
3.	"Malaya Kha- zan"	Assonora	Bardez	25 Ha.	The bund starts with the paddy field "Malaya Khazan" belonging to the community of Assonora and is situated at Assonora, Bardez Taluka and ends with the same paddy field. It is marginal to the Mapusa river.

By order and in the name of the Lieutenant Governor of Goa, Daman and Diu.

L. J. Menezes Pais, Under Secretary (Rev-I),

Panaji, 20th July, 1982.

Public Health Department

Order

No. 5/54/82-PHD

Read: → Memorandum No. 5-34-82-PHD dated 16-6-1982.

On the recommendations of the Union Public Service Commission, Dr. Jagjit Singh Saini, is hereby appointed to the post of Lecturer in Ophthalmology in the Goa Medical College, Panaji in the pay scale of Rs. 1100-50-1500-EB-60-1800 with immediate effect on the terms and conditions contained in the Memorandum referred to above.

Dr. Saini is already declared medically fit by the Medical Board.

By order and in the name of the Administrator of Goa, Daman and Diu.

M. S. Saini, Under Secretary (Health).

Panaji, 19th July, 1982.

Industries and Labour Department

Order

No. 3/43/79-ILD

The Administrator of Goa, Daman and Diu is also pleased to appoint the following Officers as the Directors of the Economic Development Corporation of Goa, Daman and Diu:—

1. Shri K. B. Shukla, Secretary Industries and Labour.
2. Shri Bansi Dhar, Finance Secretary.
3. Shri A. K. Mathur, Director, Industries and Mines.
2. S/Shri K. B. Shukla and Bansi Dhar are appointed in the place of S/Shri Satish Chandra and R. M. Vats respectively.
3. The above appointments are made in terms of Article 68 (1) (4) of Articles of Association of Economic Development Corporation of Goa, Daman and Diu.

By order and in the name of the Administrator of Goa, Daman and Diu.

S. D. Sadhale, Under Secretary (Industries and Labour).

Panaji, 19th July, 1982.

Order

No. 28/2/79-ILD

The following Award given by the Industrial Tribunal, Goa, Daman and Diu is hereby published as required under the provisions of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act XIV of 1947).

By order and in the name of the Administrator of Goa, Daman and Diu.

S. D. Sadhale, Under Secretary (Industries and Labour).

Panaji, 30th June, 1982.

IN THE INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL GOA, DAMAN & DIU,
PANAJI GOA

(Before Dr. Renato de Noronha, Presiding Officer)

Reference No. IT/32/73

1. Shri Laxman Naik and 3 others represented by the Goa National Commercial Employees' Sangh. — Workmen
V/s.
1. M/s. Industrial Nacional de Telhas — Employer
Employer represented by Adv. Shirdhar Rama P. Chodankar.
Workman represented by Shri Doinisio Fernandes.

Panaji. Dated: — 24-5-1982.

AWARD

This is a reference made by the Government of Goa, Daman and Diu by its Order No. LC/i/ID(53)/73/867, dated 3rd July, 1973, for adjudication by this Tribunal of a dispute between the above parties. The schedule annexed to the Order of reference reads as follows:

"Whether the Management of M/s. Industrial Nacional de Telhas, Sanvordem (Goa) was justified in terminating the services of their four workmen namely (1) Shri Locximan Naik, (2) Shri Quinsu (Kinisu) Macunda Desai, (3) Smt. Saroja Naidu and (4) Smt. Ganga Kadappa; If not, to what relief the said workmen are entitled?"

2. In the statement of claim filed on behalf of the workmen by the Secretary Goa Nacional Commercial Employees Sangh (INTUC) Curchorem Goa, hereinafter briefly called the Union, it is stated that the workmen mentioned in this reference alongwith other two, namely Smt. Ladu Naik and Smt. Moga Xembu Naik, after being charge-sheeted by the Management of the Employer, were subjected to a domestic Inquiry. In this Inquiry, the workmen denied the charges levelled against them; they were not allowed to take assistance of their representative to defend them, nor the contents of the inquiry proceedings were explained to them so as to afford them a reasonable opportunity to defend themselves, which is contrary to the principles of natural justice. The workmen were compelled to sign the Inquiry Proceedings much against their will and under duress; one worker, namely Shri Quinsu Desai refused to sign, as he did not know what was written in the Inquiry Proceedings; on 19-5-1973 the Management issued dismissal letters to the four workmen concerned in this reference but Shri Quinsu Desai refused to accept this letter in the absence of his representative as he did not know its contents, but he too alongwith the other 3 was stopped from working from 19-5-1973. Intervention of the Labour Commissioner was sought by the Union. The workmen had discharged their duties as per the practice in vogue, but nevertheless they were charged with the malafide intention of dismissing them for their active participation in the Trade Union activities. There were 26 workmen working in the revolver press on 12-5-1973 and, out of those, six were chosen for the issue of charge sheet and out of these six four were picked up for dismissal, purely with the intention of victimizing them. The management has not followed proper procedure while conducting the inquiry; the workmen were not given reasonable opportunity to defend themselves and the decision arrived at for dismissing the four workmen is arbitrary and unilateral; the inquiry has been conducted by the same person who issued the charge sheet and thus there was no application of mind by an impartial person. Further, conciliation proceedings in connection with their Charter of Demands were pending before the Labour Commissioner and during its pendency the workmen were dismissed. It is prayed that the dismissal order be set aside and the four workmen reinstated with full back wages.

3. In their written statement, the employer deny that the workmen were not allowed in the Inquiry to take assistance to defend themselves and that the Inquiry Proceedings were not explained to them. It is stated that they were given full opportunity to defend themselves and to bring witnesses in their defence. The proceedings were explained to them in Konkani, language known by all of them, and, therefore, there was no violation of the principles of natural justice. It is denied that the charges levelled against the workmen were malicious and with the mala fide intention of dismissing them for their active participation in the Trade Union activities. The charges were based on facts and were proved beyond reasonable doubt in the inquiry held. The Management has no knowledge whether the workmen were active Trade Union Members or not. There were no conciliation proceedings pending before the Labour Commissioner and the action taken by the Management is proper, just and bonafide.

4. The following issues were framed by Shri Kholali, the then Presiding Officer of this Tribunal:

1. Whether the dismissal of the four concerned workmen was by way of victimisation for active participation in Trade Union activities?
2. Whether the action of the Management in terminating the services of the concerned four workers is discriminatory on the ground that out of twenty six workmen, these four only were picked up for disciplinary action?

3. Were the rules of natural justice followed during the inquiry?
4. Whether the contention of the workers that the Inquiry findings are not supported by acceptable evidence is made out?".

5. Both the parties led their evidence on the above issues. The Union examined Shri Quinsu Desai, Smt. Saroja Naidu, Shri Laxman Naik and Smt. Ganga Kadrappa and the Employer examined Shri Dominic Lopes and Shri Bernard Cardozo.

6. Out of the four issues framed by the Tribunal, issues No. 1, to 3 are connected with the fairness of the domestic inquiry held by the Management and this being a preliminary issue, I shall deal with it first. These issues read as follows:

1. Whether the dismissal of the four concerned workmen was by way of victimisation for active participation in Trade Union activities.
2. Whether the action of the Management in terminating the services of the concerned four workers is discriminatory on the ground that out of twenty six workmen, these four only were picked up for disciplinary action?
3. Were the rules of natural justice followed during the inquiry?"

Since the subject matter of these issues are facts alleged by the workmen, the burden of proving them lies on the workmen. Let us see, therefore, if they have succeeded in proving the said facts.

7. The only evidence led by the workman before this Tribunal consists of the statements of Smt. Ganga Lingayat, Shri Laxman Naik and Smt. Saroja Naidu and Shri Quinsu N. Desai, the four workmen out of the six concerned in the inquiry proceedings.

i) Smt. Ganga has stated that she went away thinking that the work was over; she does not remember if she told the Inquiry Officer that she had a co-worker as her witness in the inquiry; in her presence neither Lopes nor the Manager gave their statement; the Inquiry Officer and the clerk were the only persons who were there; Shri Lopes and the Manager did not come before the Inquiry Officer in her presence; she has apologised for what had happened and has accepted her guilt before the Inquiry Officer; she is an active member of the Union.

ii) Shri Laxman Naik has stated that in the Inquiry Room there were Cota, the Inquiry Officer and Clerk Cardozo; in his presence the Enquiry Officer asked him, Laxman, whether he wanted to make any statement; he said that he has witnesses; he was not allowed to examine his witnesses; workers Pobrina and Nukusso did not come while he was there; the Inquiry Officer stopped him three times when he was making his statement; no witness was examined by the Management in his presence; sometime before 12-5-1973, Commander Pinto had told the workers not to join the Union; six workers were suspended for an incident on 9-1-1972 and, among them, he and WW1; he asked the Inquiry Officer to read out what had been written during the Inquiry and as he was refused he did not sign the Inquiry papers; he is a Leader in the Labour Union.

In his cross, he has stated that he was sent out, Pobrina called, questioned and then again he was called and asked to question Pobrina; then again he was sent out and Nukusso called inside the room and some talk went on, which he could not understand; he was again called and asked to question Nukusso; then Lopes was called in and he was asked to question Lopes; he was then sent out. He does not know whether the Inquiry was over by then. Nothing happened on the following days.

iii) Smt. Saroja Naidu has stated that Commander Pinto wrote something during the Inquiry and as she did not understand she has refused to give her thumb impression; as long as she remained there Manager Cota was not present before the Inquiry Officer and made no statement. Similarly, Lopes also made no statement in her presence before the Inquiry Officer. When she was making her statement, the Inquiry Officer stopped her in the middle and told her that it was enough.

In her cross, she has stated that in the Inquiry Room there were only the Inquiry Officer and the Clerk. No one else came there. Lopes and Manager Cota did not come to that room at all. The Inquiry Officer asked her whether she want-

ed to give her statement. She gave her statement which was written by the Clerk. She was questioned in Konkani by the Inquiry Officer. Her statement was explained to her in Konkani and then she was asked to give her thumb impression, which she refused.

iv) Shri Quinsu Desai has stated that since 4-5 years he is the Leader of the Factory Union. The Inquiry Officer asked him to put his thumb impression on the Inquiry Records, which he refused because he wanted to examine the other Co-workers of the first press and he was not allowed. He also told the Inquiry Officer that he would not participate in the Inquiry unless he was permitted to bring his witness. The Inquiry Officer told him that no witnesses would be allowed. He gave his statement which was recorded. Then he was asked to put his thumb impression which he refused. During his statement the Inquiry Officer stopped him now and then. The charges were not read out to him during the Inquiry.

In his cross, he has stated that during the Inquiry, the Inquiry Officer has asked him whether he had witnesses on his behalf. The Inquiry Officer asked if he had anything to say in respect of the charges. He replied that he was unable to understand what was being asked to him. The Inquiry Officer used to dictate the proceedings to somebody who was present. The Inquiry Officer, the witness and that somebody were the only three persons who were together during about one hour. During that time, none else came. There was also one woman present during that hour but he doesn't remember who she is. The Inquiry Officer questioned that woman in Konkani. He does not remember whether that woman was Pobrina Fernandes; the Manager did not come there at all. The Supervisor Lopes was called by the Inquiry Officer; he came and went away. The Inquiry Officer asked Lopes something in English; the Inquiry Officer informed the witness in Konkani whatever Lopes had said about the broken slices. The witness denied the broken slices. The witness was not asked to cross-exam Lopes. He did not question Pobrina as he was not allowed to put any question to her.

8. This is all the evidence led by the workmen in so far the fairness of the domestic inquiry is concerned. Although there are some contradictions in the statements made by the above workmen in this Tribunal between what they have deposed in Examination in Chief and in their Cross Examination (Vide statement of Laxman Naik who, after stating in the Examination In Chief that he was not allowed to examine his witness and that Nukusso did not come when he was there, has admitted in his cross that he was asked to question Nukusso who, otherwise, as per the Inquiry Proceedings, is the witness of the said Laxman. Similarly, the statement of Quinsu Desai, who after stating in his Examination In Chief that he wanted to examine his witness and the Inquiry Officer told him that no witness will be allowed, has, in his cross, stated that the Inquiry Officer asked him whether he had witnesses on his behalf), since all the workers who were heard had alleged various irregularities as having been committed by the Inquiry Officer while conducting inquiry and there was no suggestion to the contrary put to these workmen in their cross, coupled with the fact that the statement of the employer's witness Shri Cardozo to the effect that the 6 inquiries took two days as far as the recording of evidence is concerned, which fact is contrary to the record and only supports the workmen's contention regarding irregularities committed in the course of the Inquiry, I give the workmen the benefit of doubt and hold that the inquiry held by the Inquiry Officer was not fair and proper, as it was conducted in violation of the Principles of Natural Justice. It is to be noted that the workmen had deposed that the statements of the employer's witnesses were not recorded in their presence and that they were explained the contents of the said statements and asked to cross-examine the witnesses, which fact, to be true would amount to a material irregularity going against the basic principle that all the evidence should be led in the presence of the accused.

9. As the decision regarding the fairness of the domestic inquiry has gone against the employer, let us now see whether, on the basis of the evidence led by the parties before the Tribunal, the dismissal of the concerned workmen by the employer is justified.

The evidence led by the employer before the Tribunal consists of the statements of Shri Dominic Lopes and Shri Bernard Cardozo.

i) Shri Dominic Lopes was working as Supervisor in the employer's factory on the relevant day and time. He has stated that at about 11 a.m. he noticed that nearly 200

slices had been broken near the press; he informed the Sr. Supervisor Shri Vaz orally; Shri Vaz told him to give two blocks of 35 slices each for being pressed; he told the worker Gabriel to place two blocks on the table for being pressed, but even before Gabriel could take up the blocks, the workers refused to attend to them; these workers are Quinsu Desai, Laxman Naik, Gangamma, Saroja, Ladu and Mog; thereupon, Shri Vaz went and informed the Manager Shri Costa; Shri Vaz came back saying that the Manager had instructed that the two blocks must be worked; there upon Gabriel and Antonio put the two blocks on the table for being worked but Quinsu Desai and the other five workers above named left the press and went home. This was at about 11.05 a.m.; the other workers continued in the press but they could not do any work because of the other six who had left.

In his cross, he has stated that he has not made any written report about the incident of 12-5-1973; the broken slices had been dumped on the floor within 2 feet of the press, they were removed in the evening of that day, put in the water and then put into the press for producing slices; they got about 15 blocks out of the broken slices; on that day in the morning he counted 86 blocks and gave them to the workers at the press; this counting was done when the blocks were brought to the press section and kept in a room; he cannot say how much time is normally required for pressing 86 blocks; the breakage occurs firstly, when the blocks are being brought to the press; secondly, when they are found defective at the time of being pressed and thirdly, at the time of trimming, polishing etc., and all these breakages are dumped together. In re-examination the witness has stated that the breakage of 200 slices was extra ordinary and not an every day occurrence.

ii) Shri Bernard Cardozo's statement is only regarding the Inquiry Proceedings and, therefore, I will not refer to its contents here.

10. On the workers side, statements of Quinsu Desai, Saroja Naidu, Laxman Naik and Ganga Lingayat were recorded:

i) Quinsu Desai has stated that 86 blocks, as usual, were given to them in the first press for being worked on that day; by 11.45 the morning session was over and most of them left the work premises; only a few remained for cleaning and picking up of the left over clay; a worker by name of Nokusso stopped the press and the witness left for home after completing the work of 86 blocks; there was no breakage of any of the slices that morning; neither the Manager nor the Supervisor Lopes told him to wait for pressing more blocks; *He only heard one woman worker saying that some more presses should be worked but he did not notice who this worker was; the broken slices were not shown to him by anybody before he left.*

In his cross he has stated that the 86 blocks under work were not visible to him from the place of work; he had to stand up and peep through the machinery to see how many presses had been worked through; in the event of any breakage in the slices they are kept separately and shown to them after the 86 blocks are finished; the broken slices are remade and worked up again at that time only; *it is only after the breakage in slices has been properly attended to by the mending and reblocking, the work of 86 blocks is considered to be over; the broken slices are counted at the instance of the Supervisor by one of them; "there were breakage of slices on 12-5-1973 in our shift."; the slices were mended and pressed; on that day the broken slices were replaced and they pressed all the blocks.*

ii) Saroja Naidu has stated that on that day, as usual 86 blocks were issued in the morning and they finished all the 86 blocks by 11-45 a.m., when the work was stopped; she does not know whether there was breakage of blocks that morning; Lopes did not tell her to press two more blocks; she has denied that, on that day, she left work in the middle and went away without attending to the broken blocks.

In her cross she has stated that she has never heard Lopes or any other worker saying that there was a shortage of two blocks which had to be pressed and the workers had to finish the work and go.

iii) Laxman Naik has stated that, on that day, as usual, 86 blocks were issued in the morning for being pressed; nobody showed him any broken tiles; he also did not break any slice; Supervisor Lopes came to the press at 11.45 a.m. after the work had been completed; neither the Manager

nor the Supervisor told him that two more blocks had to be pressed that morning; *on that day they were asked to work 83 blocks instead of the usual 86.*

The cross examination of this witness is all regarding the Inquiry Proceedings and, therefore, has no relevancy to the point in discussion.

iv) Finally, we have the statement of Smt. Gangamma Lingayat; she has stated that she did not break any slice on that day nor was she shown by Lopes any broken slices; she did not see the Manager or Supervisor Vaz or Lopes within the press area that morning; she went home about 10 minutes before the work was completed.

In her cross she stated that she went home thinking that the work was over.

11. From the above evidence led by the workers it is clear that 86 blocks are to be pressed each morning session; that, on that day, as usual, the workers were supplied with 86 blocks for being pressed; that it is only after the breakage of slices is properly attended to by mending and reblocking, the work of 86 blocks is considered to be over (Vide the statement of Quinsu Desai in cross); that there was breakage of slices on that day in these workers' shift (also statement of Quinsu Desai in cross); that one woman was heard saying that some more presses should be worked (Statement of Quinsu); that, on that day, they were asked to press 88 blocks instead of usual 86 blocks (Statement of Laxman).

12. All these admissions on the part of some of the workers go to prove the employer's case that, on that day, due to unusual breakage, the workers in this press were asked to press 88 blocks instead of the usual 86, but they refused to press and went away, as stated by Shri Dominic Lopes. It is not denied that all the six workers, who were charged, were working in the said shift (press No. 2) and that the work in each press, being a team work, would prevent the other co-workers from continuing the work, in case these six workers had stopped it, as stated by Shri Lopes. Being so, the charge framed against the six workers stands fully proved and the only question that remains is the consideration of the proper punishment to each of them in view of the said misconduct.

13. The allegation of the worker's representative that there were 26 workers working in the press and out of these only 6 were chosen, purely with the intention of victimizing them is not proved at all. On the contrary, the employer's contention that only these six workers left the work and went away and the other workers continued there and could not proceed with the work has gone unchallenged.

14. The mis-conduct committed by the six workers by disobeying the order of the Management and openly defying it, in the presence of other workers, by abandoning the work and going away is undoubtedly of a serious nature and demands an exemplary punishment so as to prevent the other workers from following the bad example of the said six workers.

15. The employer has punished two workers with a mere warning and the other four with dismissal from service. Out of the four dismissed, two were taken back into service later. The employer has justified the lenient punishment imposed on the two workers Ladu and Mog on the ground that they were honestly repentant, having apologized there and then; their past record was also clean and good and both of them being first offenders, warning was considered as adequate punishment for them. Regarding the other four, in view of their bad past record, especially of Quinsu and Laxman and their lack of repentance, the adequate punishment for them, according to the employer, was dismissal which was imposed. However, says the employer, there was a suggestion made by Shri Khollali, the then Presiding Officer, in one of the hearings to take back only Saroja and Gangamma on their tendering unconditional apology and without right to back wages, thus impliedly conceding that the cases of Quinsu and Laxman stood on a different and serious footing. Although the employer was a bit reluctant to accept the suggestion because the punishment given was adequate nevertheless as it was found that Saroja and Gangamma were showing signs of true repentance and considering that their past record although bad — many oral warning for acts of misconduct — was not so serious, they accepted the suggestion and took back the other two workers on their tendering unconditional apology.

16. The representative of the workers, in his written arguments, has stated that the fact that out of the six workers

held guilty of the same misconduct, two were let off with a mere warning, two others were reemployed on the suggestion of the court and two continued dismissed would go to show that the employer was in fact prejudiced against the two male workers and has seized of this opportunity to get rid of them under the pretext of taking disciplinary action.

17. The alleged bad past record of the two workers, namely Quinsu and Laxman has not been proved by the employer, nor opportunity was given to the concerned workman, before the punishment was imposed on them, to give their say on the alleged past record. Therefore, such record cannot be considered while imposing punishment on them. The case of the workers Ladu and Mog stands on a different footing. The leniency showed by the Management towards them has been duly justified. The case of Quinsu and Laxman has to be considered on the same footing as the case of the other two workers, namely Saroj and Gangamma and adjusted to the actual circumstances. As we have seen, these two were later reinstated without any right to back wages and on tendering unconditional apology.

18. I cannot admit that all this time the concerned workers namely Quinsu and Laxman have remained idle without work. They are Labourers and they have to work to earn their daily living; it may be that after they were dismissed from this job did not get any other permanent job, as contended by them, but surely they must have done some loose work here and there to earn their livelihood. Taking into consideration this fact, I feel that a compensation of Rs. 10,000/- to each of the above two workers alongwith their reinstatement in the above job with continuity of services but without any right to back wages would meet the ends of justice and constitute a sufficient punishment for the misconduct committed by them.

19. In view of all that has been stated above, I answer to the reference by passing the following order:

ORDER

The Management of M/s. Industria Nacional de Telhas, Sanvordem, is directed to reinstate the workers Quinsu and Laxman with continuity of services but without any right to back wages and to pay a compensation of Rs. 10,000/- to each of them for all the period of time they were out of job from the Company after the re-admission of the workers Saroj and Gangamma.

Dr. Renato de Noronha
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal

Order

No. 28/2/79-ILD

The following Award given by the Industrial Tribunal, Goa, Daman and Diu is hereby published as required under the provisions of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act XIV of 1947).

By order and in the name of the Administrator of Goa, Daman and Diu.

S. D. Sadhale, Under Secretary (Industries and Labour).
Panaji, 1st July, 1982.

IN THE LABOUR COURT GOA, DAMAN AND DIU, PANAJI - GOA

(Before Dr. Renato de Noronha, Presiding Officer)

Application No. LCC/23/79

1. Shri Sebastiao Pereira — Applicant
V/s.

1. M/s. St. Joseph Carpentry Workshop — Opponent.

Applicant represented by Shri Dionisio Fernandes, Union Leader.

Opponent represented by Adv. R. Lotlikar.

Panaji, Dated: — 21-6-1982.

AWARD

This is an application filed under Section 33C(2) of the I.D.A., 1947, hereinafter briefly called the Act, read with rule 62(2) of the Industrial Dispute (Central) Rules 1957, by the above applicant against the above opponent, claiming from the latter a total sum of Rs. 6,240/- as retrenchment compensation, Gratuity, Wages, Leave Wages, and Bonus, as per the details given in the annexure.

2. It is applicant's case that he was working in the Carpentry Workshop of the opponent for 14 years and was served, alongwith 7 others, with a Retrenchment Notice dated 1-11-1978, although the actual retrenchment was effected on 17-2-1979. He was not paid his retrenchment compensation under Section 25F of the Act nor other dues, as detailed in the annexure. His last salary drawn was Rs. 312/- per month.

3. The Opponent, in its written statement, has raised a preliminary objection regarding the lack of jurisdiction of this court to entertain this application and, on merits, has contended that, in fact, he wanted to retrench the applicant and few others but did not retrench him, in view of the huge financial burden involved. Accordingly, he informed the applicant and the latter worked for him even after 17-2-1979, receiving his wages for the work done. The applicant, therefore, is now estopped from claiming that he has been retrenched by the opponent. It is submitted that the applicant, on his own, stopped attending the duties without assigning any reason or justification and thereby putting the opponent to substantial financial losses. As the opponent did not retrench the applicant, the question of payment of retrenchment compensation does not arise and, regarding the other dues claimed by the applicant, viz. gratuity, bonus etc. the opponent is not bound in law to pay the same.

4. The following issues were framed by my learned Predecessor, Dr. Coelho:

1. Does the Opponent prove that his Court has no jurisdiction to entertain this Application?
2. Does the Opponent prove that the Applicant was not retrenched from services but stopped *suo-motu* from attending duties without assigning any reasons or justification?
3. Does the Applicant prove that he is entitled to collect the amount as claimed by him in the Annexure attached to his Application?
4. Does the Opponent prove that the Applicant has received all his dues?"

5. On these issues, both the parties led their evidence. This evidence consists of the statements given before the court by the parties themselves and of the exhibits produced at the time of the statements.

6. Taking up first the issue regarding lack of jurisdiction of this Court, raised by the Opponent:

I should say that the opponent did not try to show how this Court lacks jurisdiction to entertain this application. The only point that he has clarified in his written arguments is that this court would lack jurisdiction to entertain the applicants claim for gratuity since, under the Payment of Gratuity Act, which is a self contained code, the applicant had to file his claim, if any, before the authorities prescribed in the said Act, following the procedure provided therein. He has relied on the Supreme Court Ruling in the case of State of Punjab V/s. Labour Court, Jullunder and others in 1980 I Supreme Court Cases page 4. I fully endorse the opponent's contention in this regard, in view of the Supreme Court Ruling quoted above, wherein it was held that a claim for gratuity cannot be made Under Section 33C(2) of the Act, but the applicant has to make it under the provisions of the Payment of Gratuity Act and before the authorities mentioned therein. Hence, except for the claim for gratuity for which this court has no jurisdiction, the other claims of the applicant can be dealt with by this court and there is nothing to bar the jurisdiction of this court to entertain them.

7. Coming now to the other issues:

From the Notice Exh. W-3 produced by the workman it is shown that the employer informed the applicant that his services would be terminated on 1-12-1978, which date, subsequently, was extended till 31-12-1978, by the Notice Exh. W-4. The Opponent employer has admitted this fact and said that even the Notice Exh. W-4 was not acted

upon by him in so far the applicant is concerned, on the advice of the Asstt. Labour Commissioner and due to high financial burden involved. So, according to him, the applicant and one Vinayak Natekar were asked to continue to work and, in fact, they worked till the end of March, 1979 and from 1st April, they stopped.

8. The applicant has admitted in his statement that, inspite of the notices Exh. W-3 and W-4, he continued to work at the request of the opponent but, according to him, on 17-2-1979, he was stopped from serving and, at that time, the opponent told him and Vinayak to finish the work they had in their hands, as they were paid wages for the full month of February, 1979.

9. As the retrenchment notices Exh. W-3 and W-4 were not acted upon by the Opponent in so far the applicant is concerned, because, even after the issue of the said Notices, the applicant, admittedly, continued to work for the opponent at least till 17-2-1979, it cannot be contended with out any more, as the applicant does, that his retrenchment is evident from the said notices.

10. In his statement before this Court, the applicant has stated that, on 17-2-1979, when he was retrenched by the Opponent, he and the other workman Vinayak were told to finish the work in hands as they had already been paid their daily wages for February; that, after that, no more work was given to the applicant and he was prevented from entering the factory.

11. This statement, however, is contradicted by the opponent, according to whom, the applicant, on his own, stopped coming for work. In support of his version, the opponent has produced a copy of the letter dated 6-3-1979 requesting the applicant to resume duties immediately; and copy of the reminder dated 26-4-1979, sent to the applicant by the Opponent in connection with his letter dated 6-3-1979.

12. The Opponent in his statement before this Court, has stated that the applicant and Vinayak Natekar worked till the end of March and stopped working from 1st April and denied the suggestion that they did not work in the month of March. However, the Register of Employment produced by him shows that the applicant and Vinayak have been marked absent in the said register from the afternoon of 1st March onwards. Further, the names of these two workers, which systematically appeared under serial Nos. 2 and 1 respectively, were from the month of March onwards shifted to the last positions under Nos. 7 & 6 respectively. Why? The only plausible explanation is that the opponent had already terminated the services of the applicant and Vinayak from 1st March, 1979 as contended by the applicant and; therefore, did not record, as usual, their names under serial Nos. 2 and 1 in the Employment Register. The one who stood under serial No. 3 was given serial No. 1 and the others who followed him got the corresponding Nos. with the exclusion of those who, in the meantime, were retrenched by the Opponent. Later on, perhaps to justify his version that the applicant and Vinayak Natekar had left the job on their own, the opponent added their names in the employment register and went on marking them as absent from the afternoon of 1st March onwards.

13. Further, the opponent has stated that the applicant and Vinayak Natekar, worked till the end of March and received their wages. However, he was unable to produce the wage register regarding the month of March 1979 to prove the said payment. The wage register produced by him goes up to February, 1979, which payment, otherwise, is admitted by the applicant. From the non production of the wage register regarding the month of March 1979 an adverse inference is to be drawn against the opponent to the effect that the applicant was not paid any wages regarding the month of March, 1979.

14. The letters dated 6-3-1979 and 26-4-1979, if, infact, they were written by the opponent, would be only with a view to justify, in future, his version that it is the applicant who stopped the work on his own and not the opponent who retrenched him from services.

15. From the above facts, I am convinced that it is the opponent who terminated the services of the applicant from 1-3-1979 and, therefore, the latter is entitled to retrenchment compensation and notice pay under Section 25F of the Act.

16. Let us see now what is the compensation for retrenchment to be paid to the applicant:

The applicant has produced his appointment letter (Exh. W-1) which shows that he was appointed on 1-2-1965 with the total pay of Rs. 234/- per month, which pay at the time of his retrenchment had reached Rs. 312/- per month. This fact is admitted by the opponent. The applicant was retrenched from services on 1-3-79 and, therefore, his total services at the time of retrenchment was about 14 years. At the rate of 15 days per year this works out in Rs. 2,184/-, as stated by the applicant in the annexure. Section 25F(a) also entitles the applicant to one month's Notice Pay which admittedly was not paid to the applicant for the month of March 1979 which works out in Rs. 312/-.

17. Regarding leave wages:

The applicant has produced his leave register (Exh. W-2) which shows that he is entitled to 45 days leave. At the rate of Rs. 312/- per month this works out in Rs. 468/-.

18. Regarding Bonus for 1978-79:

Since it is proved from the Employment Register produced by the opponent that there were more than 10 workers working for the opponent at least till February, 1979 (Vide Notification 1/2402/76/LAB/1169 dated 18-8-77), the applicant is entitled to bonus at the rate of 8.33 per cent, which works out in Rs. 312/-.

19. In view of all that has been stated above, I grant this application, except in so far the gratuity is concerned, and pass the following Order:

ORDER

The Opponent is directed to pay to the applicant Rs. 2,184/- as retrenchment compensation for 14 years of services, Rs. 312/- as Notice Pay, Rs. 468/- as Leave Wages for 45 days, Rs. 312/- as Bonus for the year 1978-79 and Costs of Rs. 200/-.

Dr. Renato de Noronha
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court

Order

No. 28/2/79-ILD

The following Award given by the Industrial Tribunal, Goa, Daman and Diu is hereby published as required under the provisions of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act XIV of 1947).

By order and in the name of the Administrator of Goa, Daman and Diu.

S. L. Sadhale, Under Secretary (Industries and Labour).
Panaji, 1st July, 1982.

IN THE LABOUR COURT GOA, DAMAN AND DIU, PANAJI GOA

(Before Dr. Renato de Noronha, Presiding Officer)

Application No. LCC/21/79

1. Shri Vinayak Natekar — Applicant.
V/s.

1. M/s. St. Joseph Carpentry Workshop — Opponent.
Applicant represented by Shri Dionisio Fernandes, Union Leader.
Opponent represented by Adv. R. Lotlikar.

Panaji. Dated: — 21-6-1982.

AWARD

This is an application filed under Section 33C(2) of the I.D.A., 1947, hereinafter briefly called the Act, read with rule 62(2) of the Industrial Dispute (Central) Rules 1957, by the above applicant against the above opponent, claiming

from the latter a total sum of Rs. 10,186/- as retrenchment compensation, Gratuity, Wages, Leave Wages and Bonus, as per the details given in the annexure.

2. It is applicant's case that he was working in the Carpentry Workshop of the Opponent for 16 years and was served, alongwith 7 others, with a retrenchment Notice dated 1-11-1978, although the actual retrenchment was effected on 17-2-1979. He was not paid his retrenchment compensation under Section 25F of the Act nor other dues, as detailed in the annexure. His last salary drawn was Rs. 468/- per month.

3. The opponent, in its written statement, has raised preliminary objection regarding the lack of jurisdiction of this court to entertain this application and, on merits, has contended that, in fact, he wanted to retrench the applicant and few others but did not retrench him in view of the huge financial burden involved. Accordingly, he informed the applicant and the latter worked for him even after 17-2-1979, receiving his wages for the work done. The applicant, therefore, is now estopped from claiming that he has been retrenched by the opponent. It is submitted that the applicant, on his own, stopped attending the duties without assigning any reason or justification and thereby putting the opponent to substantial financial losses. As the opponent did not retrench the applicant, the question of payment of retrenchment compensation does not arise and, regarding the other dues claimed by the applicant, viz. gratuity, bonus etc. the opponent is not bound in law to pay the same.

4. The following issues were framed by my Learned Pre-decessor, Dr. Coelho:

- "1. Does the opponent prove that this Court has no jurisdiction to entertain and decide this Application?
2. Does the Opponent prove that the Applicant was informed well in advance that his services would stand terminated from 17-2-79 and that he should collect all his dues by that date?
3. Does the Opponent prove that they are not liable to pay to the Applicant Gratuity, Bonus etc.?
4. Does the Applicant prove that he is entitled to receive the following amounts:

1. Retrenchment Compensation	Rs. 3,744.00
2. Gratuity	Rs. 3,744.00
3. Gratuity under Sec. 39(2) of Goa, D & D Shops & Estab. Act 1973 (2 mths. Wages).	Rs. 936.00
4. Wages for March 1978	Rs. 468.00
5. Leave Wages (54 days)	Rs. 828.00
6. Bonus for 1978-79 @ 8.33	Rs. 468.00"

5. On these issues, both the parties led their evidence. This evidence consists of the statements given before the court by the parties themselves and of the exhibits produced at the time of the statements.

6. Taking up first the issue regarding lack of jurisdiction of this court, raised by the opponent:

I should say that the opponent did not try to show how this Court lacks jurisdiction to entertain this application. The only point that he has clarified in his written arguments is that this court would lack jurisdiction to entertain the applicants claim for gratuity since, under the Payment of Gratuity Act, which is a self contained Code, the applicant had to file his claim, if any, before the authorities prescribed in the said Act, following the procedure provided there in. He has relied on the Supreme Court Ruling in the case of State of Punjab V/s. Labour Court, Jullunder and others in 1980 I Supreme Court Cases page 4.

I fully endorse the opponent's contention in this regard, in view of the Supreme Court Ruling quoted above, wherein it was held that a claim for gratuity cannot be made Under Section 33C(2) of the Act, but the applicant has to make it under the provisions of the Payment of Gratuity Act and before the authorities mentioned therein. Hence, except for the claim for gratuity for which this court has no jurisdiction, the other claims of the applicant can be dealt with by this court and there is nothing to bar the jurisdiction of this court to entertain them.

7. Coming now to the other issues:

From the Notice Exh. W-3 produced by the workman it is shown that the employer informed the applicant that his services would be terminated on 1-12-1978, which date subsequently was extended till 31-12-1978, by the Notice Exh. W-4. The Opponent employer has admitted this fact and said that even the Notice Exh. W-4 was not acted upon by him in so far the applicant is concerned, on the advice of the Asstt. Labour Commissioner and due to high financial burden involved. So, according to him, the applicant and one Sebastiao Pereira were asked to continue to work and, in fact, they worked till the end of March, 1979 and from 1st April, they stopped.

8. The applicant has admitted in his statement that, inspite of the notices Exh. W-3 and W-4, he continued to work at the request of the opponent but, according to him, on 17-2-1979, he was estopped from serving and, at that time, the opponent told him and Sebastiao to finish the work they had in their hands, as they were paid wages for the full month of February, 1979.

9. As the retrenchment notices Exh. W-3 and W-4 were not acted upon by the opponent in so far the applicant is concerned, because, even after the issue of the said Notices, the applicant, admittedly, continued to work for the opponent at least till 17-2-1979, it cannot be contended without any more, as the applicant does, that his retrenchment is evident from the said notices.

10. In his statement before this court, the applicant has stated that, on 17-2-1979, when he was retrenched by the opponent, he and the other workman Sebastiao were told to finish the work in hands as they had already been paid their wages for February; that, after that, no more work was given to the applicant and he was prevented from entering the factory premises.

11. This statement, however is contradicted by the opponent, according to whom, the applicant, on his own, stopped coming for work. In support of his version, the opponent has produced a copy of the letter dated 6-3-1979, requesting the applicant to resume duties immediately; copy of the letter dated 12-3-1979, alleged to have been written by the applicant to the opponent and copy of the reminder dated 26-4-1979, sent to the applicant by the opponent in connection with his letter dated 6-3-1979.

12. The applicant denies that he has written the letter dated 12-3-1979 and has objected to the bringing on record of the copy of the said letter, submitted by the opponent. In this letter, it is stated that the applicant cannot come to work *today* as he is sick and the Doctor has advised him complete rest. No sooner, he recovers he shall resume his duties. The opponent, in his statement before this Court, has stated that the applicant and Sebastiao Pereira worked till the end of March and stopped working from 1st April and denied the suggestion that they did not work in the month of March. However, the Register of Employment produced by him shows that the applicant and Sebastiao have been marked absent in the said register from the afternoon of 1st March onwards. Further, the names of these two workers, which systematically appeared under serial Nos. 1 and 2 respectively, were from the month of March onwards shifted to the last positions under Nos. 6 & 7, respectively. Why? The only plausible explanation is that the opponent had already terminated the services of the applicant and Sebastiao from 1st March, 1979, as contended by the applicant and, therefore, did not record, as usual, their names under serial Nos. 1 and 2 in the Employment Register. The one who stood under serial No. 3 was given serial No. 1 and the others who followed him got the corresponding Nos. with the exclusion of those who, in the meantime, were retrenched by the Opponent. Later on, perhaps to justify his version that the applicant and Sebastiao Pereira had left the job on their own, the opponent added their names in the employment register and went on marking them as absent from the afternoon of 1st March onwards.

13. Further, the opponent has stated that the applicant and Sebastiao Pereira worked till the end of March and received their wages. However, he was unable to produce the wage register regarding the month of March 1979 to prove the said payment. The wage register produced by him goes up to February, 1979, which payment, otherwise, is admitted by the applicant. From the non production of the wage register regarding the month of March 1979 an adverse inference is to be drawn against the opponent to the effect that the applicant was not paid any wages regarding the month of March, 1979.

14. If the applicant, as per the Employment Register, was absent from 1st March onwards, the letter dated 12-3-1979 stating that he cannot come *today* for work does not make sense at all. This, coupled with the fact that the opponent has not produced the original of the letter dated 12-3-1979, whose genuinity has been challenged by the applicant, raises serious doubts as to whether the applicant had, in fact, written the said letter or not. Also, the letters dated 6-3-1979 and 26-4-1979, if, infact, they were written by the opponent, would be only with a view to justify, in future, his version that it is the applicant who stopped the work on his own and not the opponent who retrenched him from services.

15. From the above facts, I am convinced that it is the opponent who terminated the services of the applicant from 1-3-1979 and, therefore, the latter is entitled to retrenchment compensation and notice pay under Section 25F of the Act.

16. Let us see now what is the compensation for retrenchment to be paid to the applicant:

The applicant has produced his appointment letter (Exh. W-1), which shows that he was appointed on 1-4-1973 with a total pay of Rs. 364/- per month which, in the year 1978, had reached Rs. 468/-. The applicant was retrenched from services on 1st March, 1979 and, hence, his total service was 15 years 11 months i.e. 16 years as per Section 25F(b) of the Act, at the time of retrenchment. At the rate of 15 days per year, the compensation works out to Rs. 3744/-, as stated by the applicant in the annexure.

Section 25F (a) also entitles the applicant to one month's Notice Pay, which, admittedly, was not paid to the applicant, i.e. Rs. 468/-, corresponding to the month of March, 1979 and not March 1978, as it has been wrongly stated in the annexure to the application.

16. Regarding his leave wages, he has produced his leave register (Exh. W-5) which shows that he is entitled to 39 days leave which, at the rate of Rs. 468/- per month, works out to Rs. 608/40.

17. Regarding Bonus for 1978-79:

Since it is proved from the Employment Register produced by the opponent that there were more than 10 workers working for the opponent at least till February, 1979 (Vide Notification 1/2402/76/LAB/1169 dated 18-8-77), the applicant is entitled to bonus at the rate of 8.33 per cent, which works out in Rs. 468/-.

18. In view of all that has been stated above, I grant this application, except in so far the gratuity is concerned, and pass the following Order:

ORDER

The Opponent is directed to pay to the applicant Rs. 3,744/- as retrenchment compensation for 16 years services, Rs. 468/- as Notice Pay, Rs. 608/40 as Leave Wages for 39 days, Rs. 468/- as Bonus for the year 1978-79 and Costs of Rs. 200/-.

Dr. Renato de Noronha
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court.